

Applicant	:	Brian Maxson
Appl. No.	:	10/817,272
Examiner	:	Trang U. Tran
Docket No.	:	706397.4010

## REMARKS

Claims 22-30 and 44-45 are pending in this application. Claims 22, 23, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fendley (U.S. Pat. No. 4,686,429). Claims 24, 25, and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fendley in view of common knowledge in the art. New claims 44 and 45 do not introduce any new matter.

### I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Fendley describes an apparatus capable of measuring electron beam convergence in a traditional multi-beam CRT monitor. Fendley at 1:5-9. The Fendley apparatus discloses a system whose sole objective is to calculate the “measurement of convergence errors” within a CRT device by using a quadrant detector. Col. 1:58-59, Col. 2:31-52. In order to carry out its disclosed function, Fendley describes the measurement process involved in obtaining convergence errors of a traditional CRT monitor. This is due to the inherent complexities contained within a traditional CRT, including phosphor dots 24, 26, and 28 (or phosphor coating), screen 18, faceplate 16, and shadow mask 20. All of these various layers of material are self-contained within a sealed environment comprising the CRT itself. See Fig. 1.

On the other hand, Applicants specification discloses a distinct apparatus wherein the individual structures comprising the Applicants disclosed embodiments are implemented into projection system enclosures. Accordingly, the automated convergence process disclosed by Applicants largely deviates from Fendley. For example, the “detection system” disclosed by Fendley consists of transmitting an image onto a faceplate of a four element quadrant detector wherein the quadrant detector is capable of measuring the divergence of horizontal and vertical lines—a characteristic of traditional CRTs. Col. 5:20-8:44. Whereas Applicants disclose a novel automated correction of calculated convergence error by the use of reflective beacon dots that form the variables necessary to carry out the disclosed algorithms in detecting convergence errors and, further, manipulating the blue, green, and red projection units so as to eliminate said errors. Para. 46. Applicants digital shaping circuitry is electrically

Applicant	:	Brian Maxson
Appl. No.	:	10/817,272
Examiner	:	Trang U. Tran
Docket No.	:	706397.4010

coupled to at least one positioning device that is capable of steering the beams of the projection units to compensate for any detected convergence error.

The examiner contends that Fendley discloses every limitation of independent claim 22. Applicants respectfully disagree. Pending claim 22 requires that a plurality of beacon dots be positioned about the periphery of the screen. The examiner supports the rejection by citing to Fendley Fig. 1, col. 3:52 – 5:20. Fendley fails to disclose, however, that phosphor dots 24, 26, and 28 are used to in any way to detect convergence errors. To the contrary, Fendley details the manner in which phosphor dots 24, 26, and 28 are used. Phosphor dots 24, 26, and 28 are a subset of the phosphor (or luminescent) coating applied to the internal side of a traditional CRT screen. This phosphor coating is the very basis for being able to provide color luminescence emanating from a CRT apparatus since the electron beam excites the phosphor to produce light. Fendley at 3:62 – 4:18. Moreover, Fendley fails to disclose that these phosphor dots are only to be placed about the periphery of the screen.

In addition to the fundamental differences described above, Fendley fails to disclose any positioning device that is able to maneuver the individual CRTs as a whole. Applicants particularly enable a system wherein the CRTs (or mirrors reflecting images therefrom) may be manipulated by an actuator or other mechanical means. These manipulations correct the determined misalignments automatically from feedback obtained from the digital shaping circuitry. In order to make this distinction clear, Applicants have amended independent claim 22 to include at least one positioning device operatively connected to the projection unit.

Considering the foregoing, independent claim 22 is patentably distinct over the Fendley reference. Accordingly, claim 22 is in condition for allowance. 23-30 depend from claim 22 and thus are also in condition for allowance.

## II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In view of the foregoing, it is clear that the Fendley reference cannot be relied upon to form a *prima facie* obviousness rejection of claims 24, 25, and 27-30.

Applicant : Brian Maxson  
Appl. No. : 10/817,272  
Examiner : Trang U. Tran  
Docket No. : 706397.4010

Accordingly, Applicants further submit that these claims meet the requirements for patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

III. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully assert that claims 22-30 and 44-45 are in allowable form. Prompt and favorable action on the merits of the claims is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the undersigned can be reached at (949) 567-6700.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee that may be required in connection with this Amendment to deposit account No. 15-0665.

Respectfully submitted,

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

Dated: October 2, 2008

By: 

André De La Cruz  
Reg. No. 57,229

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP  
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600  
Irvine, CA 92614-2558  
Tel. 949-567-6700  
Fax: 949-567-6710  
Customer Number: 34313